



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Cognition without content

**Citation for published version:**

Schweizer, P 2008, Cognition without content. in *AISB 2008 Convention: Communication, Interaction and Social Intelligence, 1st-4th April 2008, University of Aberdeen*. pp. 7-11.  
<<http://www.aisb.org.uk/convention/aisb08/proc/proceedings/12%20Computing%20and%20Philosophy/02.pdf>>

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

AISB 2008 Convention: Communication, Interaction and Social Intelligence, 1st-4th April 2008, University of Aberdeen

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Cognition without content

Paul Schweizer<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** According to the traditional conception of the mind, semantical content is perhaps the most important feature distinguishing mental from non-mental systems. And this traditional conception has been incorporated into the foundations of contemporary scientific approaches to the mind, insofar as the notion of ‘mental representation’ is adopted as a primary theoretical device. Symbolic representations are posited as the internal structures that carry the information utilized by intelligent systems, and they also comprise the formal elements over which cognitive computations are performed. But a fatal tension is built into the picture - to the extent that symbolic ‘representations’ are formal elements of computation, their alleged content is completely gratuitous. I argue that the computational paradigm is thematically inconsistent with the search for content or its supposed vehicles. Instead, the concern of computational models of cognition should be with the *processing structures* that yield the right kinds of input/output profiles, and with how these structures can be implemented in the brain.

## 1 CLASSICISM

According to the traditional conception of the mind, semantical content is perhaps the most important feature distinguishing mental from non-mental systems. For example, in the scholastic tradition revived by Brentano [1], the *essential* feature of mental states is their ‘aboutness’ or intrinsic representational aspect. And this traditional conception has been incorporated into the foundations of contemporary scientific approaches to the mind, insofar as the notion of ‘mental representation’ is adopted as a primary theoretical device. For example, in classical (e.g. Fodorian) cognitive science, Brentano’s legacy is preserved in the view that the properly cognitive level is distinguished precisely by appeal to representational content. There are many different levels of description and explanation in the natural world, from quarks all the way to quasars, and according to Fodor, it is only when the states of a system are treated as representational that we are dealing with the genuinely cognitive level.

The classical paradigm in cognitive science derives from Turing’s basic model of computation as rule governed transformations on a set of syntactical elements, and it has taken perhaps its most literal form of expression in terms of Fodor’s Language of Thought hypothesis (henceforward LOT) [2], wherein mental processes are explicitly viewed as formal operations on a linguistically structured system of internal symbols. In particular, propositional attitude states, such as belief and desire, are treated as computational relations to sentences in an internal processing language, and where the LOT sentence serves to represent the propositional content of the intentional state. Symbolic representations are thus posited as the internal structures that carry the information utilized by intelligent systems, and they also comprise the formal elements over which

cognitive computations are performed. According to the traditional and widely accepted belief-desire framework of psychological explanation, an agent’s actions are both *caused* and explained by intentional states such as belief and desire. And on the LOT model, these states are sustained via sentences in the head that are formally manipulated by the cognitive processes which lead to actions.

Fodor notes that particular tokens of these LOT sentences could well turn out to be specific neuronal processes or brain states. The formal syntax of LOT thus plays a crucial triad of roles: it can represent meaning, it’s the medium of cognitive computation, and it can be physically realized. So the syntax of LOT can in principle supply a link between the high level intentional description of a cognitive agent, and the actual neuronal process that enjoy causal power. This triad of roles allows content bearing states, such as propositional attitudes, to explain salient pieces of behavior, such as bodily motions, if the intermediary syntax is seen as realized in neurophysiological configurations of the brain. Because the tokens of LOT are semantically interpretable and physically realizable, they form a key theoretical bridge between content and causation. In this manner, a very elegant (possible) answer is supplied to the longstanding theoretical question of how mental states, such as beliefs and desires, could be viewed as causes of actual behaviour, without violating fundamental conservation laws in physics.

So at first sight, this computational approach to cognition might seem to provide a compelling and harmonious theory of the mind/brain, potentially uniting the traditional notion of mental representation with the causally efficacious level of neural machinery. But alas, a fatal tension is already built into the picture: a central purpose of the symbolic structures is to carry content, and yet, to the extent that they are formal elements of computation, their alleged content is completely gratuitous. Computation is essentially a series of manipulations performed on *uninterpreted* syntax, and formal structure alone is sufficient for all effective procedures. The specification and operation of such procedures makes no reference whatever to the intended meaning of the symbols involved. Indeed, it is precisely this limitation to syntactic *form* that has enabled computation to emerge as a mathematically rigorous discipline. If syntax alone is not sufficient, and additional understanding or interpretation is required, then the procedure in question is, by definition, *not* an effective one. But then the purported content of mental ‘representations’ is rendered superfluous to the computations that comprise the ‘cognitive’ processes of cognitive science. The intended interpretation of internal syntax makes absolutely no difference to the formal mechanics of mind.

## 2 CONNECTIONISM

For a number of years now there has been a high profile struggle between opposing camps within the computational approach to the mind. In contrast to the classical paradigm derived from Turing, connectionist systems are based on networks of large numbers of simple but highly interconnected units that are brain-

<sup>1</sup> School of Informatics, Univ. of Edinburgh, EH8 9LE, UK. Email: paul@inf.ed.ac.uk.

like in their inspiration. But according to Fodor [3], the brain-like architecture of connectionist networks tells us nothing about their suitability as models of *cognitive* processing, since it still leaves open the question of whether the mind is such a network at the representational level. He concedes that the connectionist approach may be the right type of architecture for the medium of implementation, which would mean that it characterizes a level below that of genuine mental structure. In view of the foregoing tension within the classical paradigm concerning formal syntax and the inefficacy of content, I would argue that Fodor is on very weak ground when he insists that, within a computational approach, the representational level is fundamental. However, a number of connectionists have taken up the challenge and seek out ways of projecting representational content onto artificial neural networks.

One comparatively recent such attempt (Churchland [4], Laakso, A. and G. Cottrell [5], O'Brien, G. and J. Opie [6]) uses cluster analysis to locate 'vehicles' of representational content within artificial neural networks, where such clusters serve as surrogates for the classical notion of internal syntax. Along with serious difficulties in equating clusters with the syntax of traditional computation, I would contend that such attempts suffer from exactly the same built-in tension that afflicts the LOT model; namely, the purported content for which the clusters serve as vehicles does no work in the processing path leading from inputs to outputs. Just as in the classical case, the postulation of content within the connectionist framework is gratuitous, because it plays no role in the cognitive manipulation of inputs to yield the salient outputs. Indeed, if content weren't gratuitous, then computational versions of cognitive processing would be lamentably deficient in terms of their specification of the inputs. These are characterized solely in formal or syntactical terms, and content is entirely absent from the external stimuli recognized by the operations that can be defined within the model. If representational content were at all relevant, then cognitive systems would have to process content *itself*. But according to computational methods, content is not specified with the input, nor does it play any efficacious role in internal processing. So, from a perspective that takes computation as the theoretical foundation for cognition, it seems quite retrograde to posit content on top of the factors that do the actual work. Surely this is an exemplary occasion for invoking Ockham's razor.

### 3 THE CHINESE ROOM

Of course, John Searle's celebrated Chinese Room Argument (henceforward CRA) [7] runs the dialectic in exactly the reverse direction: rather than taking the formal, syntactic nature of computation as a reason for eschewing content in a properly naturalistic approach to the mind, Searle instead takes it as a reason for rejecting computation as the appropriate theory of the mental.

So, from the perspective of the present discussion, it is instructive to explicitly cast Searle's argument in terms of the separability of syntactical structure from its intended meaning. In what follows I will abstract away from the somewhat picturesque details of Searle's original version and express the logical core of the CRA via two premises and a conclusion:

- (1) semantical content is an essential feature of the mind,
- (2) syntactical manipulations cannot capture this content, therefore

- (3) the mind cannot be reduced to a system of syntactical manipulations.

Preimse (1) is an expression of the traditional conception of mentality, and is accepted by both Searle and by his opponents in orthodox cognitive science and AI. As stated above, classical cognitive science and AI view the mind according to the model of rule governed symbol manipulation, and premise (1) is embraced insofar as the manipulated symbols are supposed to possess representational content. Searle's dispute with cognitive science and AI centers on his rejection of the idea that internal computation can shed any real light on mental content, which leads to his conclusion (3), and to a concomitant dismissal of the research paradigm central to cognitive science and AI.

In response, a standard line for defenders of the paradigm is to try and defuse the CRA by arguing against premise (2), and claiming that the manipulated symbols really do possess some canonical meaning or privileged interpretation. However, I would urge that this is a strategic error for those who wish to defend the computational approach. As stated above, a distinguishing mathematical virtue of computational systems is precisely the fact that the formal calculus can be executed without any appeal to meaning. Not only is an interpretation intrinsically unnecessary to the operation of computational procedures, but furthermore, there is no unique interpretation determined by the computational syntax, and in general there are arbitrarily many distinct models for any given formal system.

Many classical *negative* results in mathematical logic stem from this separability between formal syntax and meaning. The various upward and downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorems show that formal systems cannot capture intended meaning with respect to infinite cardinalities. As another eminent example, Gödel's incompleteness results involve taking a formal system designed to be 'about' the natural numbers, and systematically reinterpreting it in terms of its own syntax and proof structure. As a consequence of this 'unintended' interpretation, Gödel is able to prove that arithmetical truth, an exemplary *semantical* notion, cannot, in principle, be captured by finitary proof-theoretic means.

Computational formalisms are syntactically closed systems, and in this regard it is fitting to view them in narrow or solipsistic terms. They are, by their very nature, independent of the 'external world' of their intended meaning and, as mentioned above, they are incapable of capturing a unique interpretation, since they cannot distinguish between any number of alternative models. This can be encapsulated in the observation that the relation between syntax and semantics is fundamentally *one-to-many*; any given formal system will have arbitrarily many different interpretations. And this intrinsically one-to-many character obviates the possibility of deriving or even attributing a unique semantical content merely on the basis of computational structure.

These (and a host of other) powerful results on the inherent limitations of syntactical methods would seem to cast a rather deflationary light on the project of explicating *mental content* within a computational framework. Indeed, they would seem to render such goals as providing a computational account of natural language semantics or propositional attitude states profoundly problematic. Non-standard models exist even for such rigorously defined domains as first-order arithmetic and fully axiomatized geometry. And if the precise, artificial system of first-order arithmetic cannot even impose isomorphism on its various models, how then could a *program*, designed to process a specific natural language, say Chinese, supply a basis for the claim that the units of Chinese syntax possess a *unique* meaning?

So I think that the advocates of computationalism make the wrong move by accepting Searle's bait and taking on board the seemingly intransigent 'symbol grounding problem' that results. Instead I would accept Searle's negative premise (2) and agree that computation is too weak to underwrite any interesting version of (1). Hence I would concur with Searle's reasoning to the extent of accepting the salient *conditional* claim that *if* (1) is true *then* (3) is true as well. So the real crux of the issue lies in the truth-value of (1), without which the consequent of the *if-then* statement cannot be detached as a free-standing conclusion. Only by accepting the traditional, *a priori* notion of mentality assumed in premise (1), does (3) follow from the truth of (2). And it's here that I would diverge from the views of both Searle and orthodox cognitive science.

#### 4 CONSCIOUS PRESENTATION

In explicating and defending his pivotal premise (1), Searle [8, 9] again follows Brentano, in claiming that the human mind possesses original intentionality because it can experience conscious presentations of the objects that its representational states are 'about'. Thus it is conscious experience that ultimately underwrites the intrinsic aboutness of genuine intentional states. So Searle holds that consciousness supplies the basis for the truth of premise (1), and he further believes that consciousness arises from the specific causal powers of the brain considered as a physical structure, rather than from multiply realizable symbol manipulation. Hence intentionality is tethered to brain processes via consciousness, and Searle thereby attempts to naturalize the traditional notion of mentality, while at the same time discrediting the computational paradigm, since he argues that computation has nothing to do with consciousness.

And while I would agree with Searle's view that consciousness arises from physical brain activities rather than from multiply realizable computational structure, I would nevertheless argue, *contra* Searle, that conscious experience, just like symbol manipulation, is too weak to underwrite any interesting version of tenet (1). With respect to the view that conscious experience is the cornerstone of intentionality, the CRA simply begs the question, because it presupposes that the homunculus Searle, replete with conscious presentations, *really does* understand English in some special way. Searle appeals to himself as the locus of genuine intentionality in the Chinese Room, and he would support this by citing the fact that he is consciously aware of the meanings of English expressions. For example, he can entertain a conscious image of the referent of the English string 'h-a-m-b-u-r-g-e-r', while for him the strings of Chinese characters are completely devoid of conscious meanings. Ostensibly, this special understanding of English enables him to follow the program and manipulate the 'meaningless' Chinese symbols. Hence lack of conscious presentation with respect to the semantics of Chinese constitutes the real asymmetry between the two languages, and this underlies Searle's claim that genuine understanding occurs in the case of one language and not the other.

But this line of thought is not particularly compelling, since one can easily concede that Searle has episodes of conscious awareness which attend his processing of English, while at the same time denying that these episodes are sufficient to establish intrinsic content, or to ground the semantics of natural language expressions. Indeed, the mere occurrence of conscious presentations is too weak to even establish that they themselves play a role in Searle's ability to follow the English instruction

manual. Instead, I would argue that what consciousness actually provides is the foundation for the subjective *impression*, had by Searle and others, that the human mind enjoys some mysterious and seemingly magical form of intentionality with the power to uniquely determine representational content.

Thus when Searle contends that our mental states are 'really about' various external objects and states of affairs, this is merely an expression of the fact that, introspectively, it *seems to us* as if our mental states had some such special property. Conscious experience is clearly sufficient to provide the source for this belief, since conscious experience determines how (some of) our mental states appear to us. But it cannot provide a basis for concluding that the belief is *true*, unless consciousness is something much more mysterious and powerful than the resources of natural science can allow. Brentano famously dismissed naturalism, and he thereby gave himself some room for the claim that consciousness underwrites the mind's essential intentionality. However, if one accepts naturalism and views consciousness as a phenomenon supported by, say, the causal properties of electrochemical reactions taking place inside the skull, then one should just bite the bullet and accept that it is too weak to support Brentano's thesis that intentionality is an essential feature of the mind.

It would be straying too far from the main goal of the article to expand on this latter claim at any great length, but considerations based on the 'narrow' status of consciousness should suffice to illustrate the central point. It is widely held by naturalists that occurrent conscious states must supervene upon occurrent, *internal*, physical states and processes of organisms. As a consequence, something outside the boundaries of an organism cannot affect consciousness, unless it makes some relevant impact on the occurrent, internal physical states and processes, most typically through inputs to the sensory mechanisms. But then the objection raised by Searle in the CRA against the computational paradigm comes back to undermine his own position: the relation between consciousness and its object becomes one-to-many, just as the relation between computational syntax and its interpretation is one-to-many. Any number of different external causes could yield exactly the same conscious experience (by inducing exactly the same internal physical states and processes), just as a given formal system can have arbitrarily many distinct interpretations. Therefore conscious experience is, by its very nature, too weak to determine a unique object that one is conscious of. This problem is at the heart of Cartesian scepticism, and it only gets worse within the narrow confines of naturalism. In a more contemporary guise, Putnam's celebrated brains-in-a-vat argument [10] exploits this solipsistic feature to show that conscious psychological states are too weak to capture the semantics of natural language.

#### 5 ANTI-REPRESENTATIONALISM

There have been a number of high profile positions advanced in negative reaction to 'classical' cognitive science that take anti-representationalism as one of their hallmarks, including dynamical systems theory (e.g. Van Gelder [11]), behaviour based robotics (e.g. Brooks [12]), approaches utilizing sensory-motor affordances (e.g. Noë [13]), and some varieties of connectionism. A common factor is that these views all advance some version of the slogan 'intelligence without representation'. In order to locate my position on the salient philosophical landscape, it is worth noting that it is *not* anti-representational in this sense. On my view, there could well be internal structures that play many of the roles that people would ordinarily expect of representations, and

this is especially true at the level of perception, sensory-motor control and navigation. So I would be quite happy to accept things like spatial encodings, somatic emulators, internal mirrorings of relevant aspects of the external environment. Ultimately this boils down to questions that have to be settled empirically in the case of biologically induced agents, but unlike the anti-representationalists, I do not deny that the most plausible form of cognitive architecture may well incorporate internal structures and stand-ins that many people would be tempted to *call* ‘representations’.

But I would argue that this label should be construed purely in a weak, operational sense, and should not be conflated with the more robust traditional conception. To the extent that internal structures can encode, mirror or model external objects and states of affairs, they do so via their own causal and/or syntactic properties. And again, to the extent that they influence behaviour or the internal processing of inputs to yield outputs, they do this solely in virtue of their causal and/or syntactic properties. There is nothing about these internal structures that could support Searle’s or Brentano’s notion of original intentionality, and there is no independent or objective fact of the matter regarding their ‘real’ content or meaning.

So what I deny is not that there may be internal mechanisms that reflect external properties in various systematic and biologically useful ways. Instead I would deny that there is anything *more* to this phenomenon than highly sensitive and evolved relations of calibration between the internal workings of an organism and its specialized environmental context. Evolutionary history can be invoked to yield interesting heuristics with respect to these physical relations of calibration, and perhaps support counterfactuals regarding their role in the organism’s adaptive success. But evolution is based on random mutation, and natural ‘selection’ is an equally purposeless mechanism. Neither can provide the theoretical resources sufficient to ground the strong traditional notion of ‘genuine aboutness’.

Thus if I had to coin a competing slogan to encapsulate my own position, it would be something like ‘representation without intentionality’. If one is truly committed to naturalism, then there is only a difference of degree and complexity, but not in kind between, say, the reflection of moonlight in a pond and the retinal image of the moon in some organism’s visual system. Proponents of the orthodox view are inclined to think that a sufficient difference in degree and complexity somehow yields an esoteric difference in *kind*, a difference that allows us to cross the conceptual boundary from mere causal correlations to ‘genuine aboutness’. But I would contend that naturalism itself supplies an asymptotic limit for this curve, and that the boundary can be crossed only by invoking non-natural factors.

## 6 CONCLUSION

According to the position advocated herein, Fodor’s characteristic insistence on representational *content* embodies an unfortunate commitment to an a priori view of the mind that does not fit within the context of naturalistic explanation. The crucial point to notice is that internal ‘representations’ do all their scientifically tangible *cognitive* work solely in virtue of their physical/formal/mathematical structure. There is nothing about them, qua efficacious elements of internal processing, that is ‘about’ anything else. Content is not an explicit component of the input, nor is it acted upon or transformed via cognitive computations. All that is explicitly present and causally relevant are computational structure plus supporting physical mechanisms,

which is exactly what one would expect from a naturalistic account.

In order for cognitive structures to do their job, there is no need to posit some additional ‘content’, ‘semantical value’, or ‘external referent’. Such representation talk may serve a useful heuristic role, but it remains a conventional, observer-relative ascription, and accordingly there’s no independent fact of the matter, and so there isn’t a sense in which it’s possible to go wrong or be mistaken about what an internal configuration is ‘really’ about. Instead, representational content can be projected onto an internal structure when this type of gloss plays an opportune role in characterizing the overall processing activities which govern the system’s interactions with its environment, and hence in predicting its salient input/output patterns. But it is simply a matter of convenience, convention and choice, and does not reveal an underlying fact of the matter nor any essential characteristics of the system.

From the point of view of the system, these internal structures are manipulated *directly*, and the notion that they are ‘directed towards’ something else plays no role in the pathways leading from cognitive inputs to intelligent outputs. Hence the symbol grounding problem is a red herring – it isn’t necessary to quest after some elusive and mysterious layer of ‘real’ content, for which these internal structures serve as the mere syntactic vehicle. Syntactical and physical processes are all we have, and their efficacy is not affected by the purported presence or absence of meaning. I would argue that the computational paradigm is thematically inconsistent with the search for content or its supposed vehicles. Instead, the concern of computational models of cognition should be with the internal *processing structures* that yield the right kinds of input/output profiles of a system embedded in a particular environmental context, and with how such processing structures are implemented in the system’s physical machinery. These are the factors that do the work and are sufficient to explain all of the empirical data, and they do this using the normal theoretical resources of natural science. Indeed, the postulation of content as the essential feature distinguishing mental from non-mental systems should be seen as the last remaining vestige of Cartesian dualism, and, contra Fodor, naturalized cognition has no place for a semantical ‘ghost in the machine’. When it comes to computation and content, only the vehicle is required, not the excess baggage.

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Brentano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. (1874).
- [2] J. Fodor, *The Language of Thought*, Harvester Press, (1975).
- [3] J. Fodor and Z. Pylyshyn, Connectionism and Cognitive Architecture: A Critical Analysis, *Cognition*, 28: 3-71, (1988).
- [4] P. M. Churchland, Conceptual Similarity Across Sensory and Neural Diversity: The Fodor/Lepore Challenge Answered, *Journal of Philosophy*, 96(1): 5-32, (1998).
- [5] A. Laakso and G. Cottrell, Content and Cluster Analysis: Assessing Representational Similarity in Neural Systems, *Philosophical Psychology*, 13(1): 47-76, (2000).
- [6] G. O’Brien and J. Opie, Connectionist Vehicles, Structural Resemblance, and the Phenomenal Mind, *Communication and Cognition*, 34: 13-38, (2001).
- [7] J. Searle, Minds, Brains and Programs, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3: 417-424, (1980).
- [8] J. Searle, Consciousness, Explanatory Inversion and Cognitive Science, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 13: 585-596, (1990).
- [9] J. Searle, *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, MIT Press, (1992).

- [10] H. Putnam, Brains in a Vat. In: *Reason, Truth and History*, H. Putnam, Cambridge University Press, (1981).
- [11] T. Van Gelder, Dynamics and Cognition. In: *Mind Design II*, J. Haugeland (Ed.), MIT Press, (1996).
- [12] R. Brooks, Intelligence without Representation. In: *Mind Design II*, J. Haugeland (Ed.), MIT Press, (1996).
- [13] A. Noë, *Action in Perception*, MIT Press, (2004).